REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-13 and 15-20 are rejected.

In the present Office Action, claims 1-7 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,326,926 (Shoobridge) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,452,910 (Vij). Claims 8-13, 15-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vij, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,452,910 (Young). Claim 14 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Independent claims 1, 8, and 12 include the general feature of conducting communication with mobile units using a first wireless protocol and receiving management communications using a second, different wireless protocol. This feature allows remote management of the access point or other device in the event the connection via the first protocol is unavailable. For instance, if the wireless LAN implementing an 802.11 protocol is unavailable, the access point may be managed by sending management communications over a different protocol connection, such as Bluetooth.

The Office Action asserts that the combination of Shoobridge and Vij teaches these features. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Office Action maintains the position that Vij teaches receiving management communications at the access point using the second protocol. It is entirely unclear what the Office Action asserts is the management communication received at the access point using the second protocol to allow management of the access point. The Office Action equates the reformatting of data from the vehicle module to receiving management communications at the access point to allow management of the access point. The passage cited by the Office Action related to reformatting data has nothing to do with management communications. The data is reformatted from a Bluetooth® protocol to an Ethernet protocol so

the data can be forwarded to the server. The data conversion is not a function related to management of the access point. Indeed, the access point is not at all affected by the content of the data, but rather the data is simply forwarded to the server downstream of the access point. Hence, the access point is merely the conduit of the data between the vehicle module and the server. No aspect of the data reformatting relates to receiving management communications at the access point using a second protocol to allow management of the access point.

For at least these reasons, claims 1, 8, 12, and all claims depending therefrom are allowable over the combination of Shoobridge and Vij. The other cited art fails to correct the defects delineated above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (713) 934-4070 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 9, 2006

/Scott F. Diring/

Scott F. Diring
Reg. No. 35,119
Williams Morgan & Amerson, P.C.
10333 Richmond Avenue, Suite 1100
Houston, TX 77042
(713) 934-4070
(713) 934-7011 (Fax)

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS